



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

peculiar to the Classical languages, we must agree with Bernhardt that the work as a whole is an independent composition, but that the author has borrowed, ideas probably, constructions certainly, from the Classical languages. In other words, the work is probably composite. In this paper, in addition to what was already known, I have attempted to present further reasons, from internal evidence, for believing that the Skeireins is not a word-for-word translation of a Greek original and, at the same time, to show that there are unmistakable traces of Classical, certainly of Greek, probably of Latin, influence.

GEORGE H. MCKNIGHT.

Cornell University.

LE PAS SALADIN.

III.

THE following is not an exhaustive study of the language of the text, all characteristics not essential to the determination of dialect having been omitted. In referring to the dialect spoken in central France, the shorter word "French" is almost always used in place of "Isle-de-France."

VOWELS.

A.

Latin tonic *a* in open syllable and before oral consonants becomes *e* and *ei*.

Examples:—1, recorder; 38, sermoner; 56, reposer; 72, loyaute; 90, assembler; 100, bonte; 106, conte; 113, tref; 126, grever; 127, mer; 128, entree; 147, aler; 202, mandes; 17, livreis; 101, aleir; 144, conteit; 175, larmeir; 270, esporonneit; 287, meir; 302, fermeis; 303, chiteis; 340, leis.

This development to *ei* is of some importance as it occurs so regularly throughout the text. The rhymes *bonte: aleir*, 100; *vorres: larmeir*, 175, as well as in lines 276, 314, and 384, prove that there was no difference in the pronunciation of *e* and *ei*, which must have been *e*. The writing of *ei* for Latin *a* belongs especially to the East, and its presence in Picardy, where it is found only in the eastern half, is probably due to the influence of the Wallonian (*Lor. Ps.* viii; *Rom. Stud.* iv, 360; *Neu.* 18).

Alicum becomes *age*.

Examples:—125, 135, 328, 441, 536, 553, 594, passages; 420, domage; 591, barnages; 595, lignage.

Aige, a special eastern characteristic, is frequently found in Wallonian, and more rarely in Picardy. In French, it is always *age* (*Chev.*, xxxiii; *Neu.*, 12; *Rom.* xvii, 555).

Atr becomes *er*.

Examples:—32, pere; 111, mere.

This is the regular French characteristic, while the eastern *eir*, or *air* does not occur (*Rom.* xvii, 554).

After a palatal, or palatalized consonant, *a* becomes *ie*, *e*.

Examples:—12, croisier; 56, aisier; 117, prisier; 125, 141, gaitier; 147, laisies; 176, pitier; 104, 453, cher.

The group *ie* was originally pronounced as a diphthong with the accent on the *i* (*Rom.* vi, 322). Later it was written and pronounced *e*. Schwan, 289, says that the diphthong *ie* was reduced to *e* at the end of the thirteenth century, and that the first examples are found after *ch*, as *cher* for *chier*. In the east of France, the reduction did not take place before the middle of the thirteenth century, and it rarely occurred in Picardy. Except in the Norman dialect, which lies outside of the present discussion, the change seems to have been a late one, and the fact that the rhymes *ie: e* occur quite frequently in the text, would indicate that the MS. could not have been written much before the close of the thirteenth century. In lines 107 and 515, *ie* is pronounced *e* in *pite*, a word which has retained the diphthong to the present day.

a+n becomes *an*.

Examples:—8, remembrance; 42, demorance; 84, lechans; 85, 118, soudans; 130, derubans; 218, avant; 219, devant.

The nasalized *a* is of little importance in the present investigation, for since the twelfth century, both *ā* and *ē* were pronounced alike in most of the northeastern dialects as well as in French (*Sch.*, 298). They are found rhyming together in line 7; namely, *countenance: remembrance*, but elsewhere in the text they are generally kept separated.

The development of *ain* and *ein* is similar to the above. They rhyme together in the twelfth century, and both rhyme with *oin* in

the middle of the thirteenth century (*Sch.*, 304, 305). That their pronunciation in the text was the same is proven by the writing of *point* for *peint*, in lines 6 and 597, and of *maine* for *meine*, in line 576.

Checked tonic *a* and atonic *a* remain.

Examples :—2, garderent; 4, palasin; 9, regarder; 51, passent; 101, laisast; 173, apareilles; 180, embrases; 180, armes; 187, riguarda; 193, Richart; 197, cheval.

The writing of *ai* for *a* is a special Burgundian and eastern characteristic, and more rarely found in both the Wallonian and Picard (*Lor. Ps.*, xiii; *Chev.*, xxxiv). In the former it may occur in the ending of the imperfect subj., as *aïsse*, *aïst*, etc. (*Rom.* xvii, 568).

Two examples of *ai* for *a* are found in the text; namely, *païsseront*, 373, and *trouaïst*, 391.

a before a palatal or palatalized consonant becomes *ai*, *e*.

Examples :—56, aisier; 82, fais; 83, pais; 91, mavaïs; 147, laïssies; 183, aiderons; 184, faire; 158, mes (magis).

Originally *ai* was a diphthong and in the Alexis it still assonances with *a*. It begins to rhyme with *e* in the early part of the twelfth century, and by the middle of the thirteenth century *ai* was also pronounced *e* (*Sch.*, 281). The reduction of the diphthong was somewhat later in the north. In the text it is always found rhyming with itself, but the pronunciation was no doubt *e*, as this vowel replaces it in a few words (*Auc.*, 60; *Rom.* xvii, 555).

al+consonant becomes *au*, *a*.

Examples :—21, faus; 44, vassaus; 72, loy-aute; 182, hautement; 183, loyaument; 192, haut; 199, autreteit; 266, chevaux; 294, roiaumes; 32, madit; 78, 91, mavaïs.

The regular French form is *au*, while *a* belongs to the Wallonian, where *l* fell without being vocalized. The rhymes *combatre*: *autre*; *haut*: *Richart*; *chevaux*: *sengira*, in lines 170, 192 and 266, appear to indicate a Wallonian pronunciation, but they are not impossible in French, as *au* remained a falling diphthong as late as the sixteenth century (*Sch.*, 290).

In the East, pretonic *a* is often found written in place of other vowels. A few examples are

found in the text. 259, 319, *aston*; 358, *astoit* (*Rom.* xvii, 560).

In line 108, *e*, out of Latin *a*, rhymes with open *ε*, *conforterent*: *ere*. The open and close *e* were pronounced alike at the beginning of the twelfth century, but *e*, out of *a*, remained distinct until the middle of the thirteenth century (*Sch.*, 272).

E.

Tonic *ε* in open syllable becomes *ie*.

Examples :—24, Pieres; 70, rien; 186, 197, pies; 195, 405, 417, bien; 236, tient; 249, convient; 495, tient; 596, iert.

Deus becomes *Dieu*, *Deu*, *Die*.

Examples :—32, 353, 611, Dieu; 50, Deu; 601, Die.

Dieu and *Deu* are French forms, while *Die* is regularly Picard. The diphthong *ie* replaced both *ieu*, out of *iu*, and the older *ieu* from *eu* (*Chev.*, xlv; *Neu.*, 42).

ε before a palatal or palatalized consonant becomes *i*.

Examples :—25, 61, 193, sire; 117, 263, pri-sier; 135, 164, 362 *mi* (medium); 226, pris.

No examples occur of *ε*+*j*>*ei*, which is often found in Wallonian. The Picard has *i*, like the French (*Z.* xii, 256; *Z.* ii, 276, 300).

Open *ε* in position remains.

Examples :—34, 55, 40, 64, 83, etc., terre; 68, estre.

The well known Picard and Wallonian characteristic of writing *ie* for *e* does not occur (*Alex.*, 269; *Chev.*, xxxvii).

εl+consonant becomes *el*, *iau*, *ia*.

Examples :—378, elme; 178, biaux; 285, biaux; 474, biaute; 302, castias.

The *el* of *elme* was the original development of *εl*+consonant, and hence common to all the dialects; it was retained in Lorraine. With this exception, all of the examples show Picard influence. *Castias*, line 302, may be either Picard or Wallonian, as in the latter dialect *l* falls without being vocalized, and it has the vowel of the former. However, neither *iau*, nor *ea* belong exclusively to their respective dialects, and in this, as in most other cases, there is a mixture of forms near the frontiers (*Z.* i, 564; *Auc.*, 64).

E.

Tonic *ē* in open syllable becomes *oi*.

Examples:—3, 15, 29, 41, etc., roy; 7, veoir; 30, quoy; 74, moy; 113, soie; 216, 227, foy; 213, voirs.

The diphthong *oi* is common to most dialects, but not to the Norman, where the older *ei* was retained. The two examples *reiz*, 246, and *francheis*, 315, therefore, seem to be due to Norman influence, but as they stand alone, they are probably mistakes of the copyist (*Sch.*, 84).

In the northeast atonic *oi* is reduced to *i*, especially before *ss*, as in *comissance*, but this reduction does not occur in the text (*Rom.* xvii, 557; *Auc.*, 65).

Examples:—423, connoissoit; 428, connoissance.

Before *l*, *ei* remains.

Examples:—114, vermeil; 115, soleil; 415, merveillant; 195, 283, 321, etc., conseil; 510, oreille; 511, merveille.

ē+*n* becomes *ein*, *ain*, *oin*.

Examples:—448, pleine; 576, maine; 337, enmoient.

The number of examples is too small to show how *ē*+*n* was written by the author, and none of them occur in rhyme. In *enmoient*, we have one of the few special Burgundian characteristics that are met with in the text.

*ē*l+consonant becomes *eu*, *eau*.

Examples:—47, eus; 599, ceulz; 2, cheaus; 351, eaus.

In the case of *ē*l+consonant, the French did not develop an *a* before *l*, thus half of the above examples are of eastern origin (*Auc.*, 64; *Z.* ii, 275).

-*etja* becomes -*ece*.

Examples:—371, 475, proëce; 413, noblece.

The suffix -*etja* regularly became -*eise*, -*oise*, but it gave way early to the learned suffix -*ece*. This in turn was replaced at the close of the thirteenth century by -*esse*. (*Sch.*, 251; *Jahrb.* viii, 36).

I.

Tonic *i* remains.

Examples:—4, palasin; 14, Sarrasins; 581, vin.

This is the usual form in all the dialects, though a few changes are noted in the Wal-

lonian, where *ien* is sometimes written for *inum* (*Rom.* xvii, 558).

o.

Tonic *o* in open syllable becomes *ue*, *oe*, *eu*.

Examples:—36, 418, 508, cuer; 75, 295, suer; 260, 409, puet; 123, voet; 261, veult.

The development of *o* is similar in all the dialects with which we are concerned, but it did not take place in all of them at the same time. The final diphthongization to *eu* first began in the north, and was completed before the close of the thirteenth century; but it did not become universal in France before the fourteenth. In addition to the regular development, tonic *o* in Wallonian may become *ou* and *oi* (*Neu.*, 47; *Sch.*, 276, 277; *Rom.* xvii, 559).

o before a palatal or palatalized consonant becomes *ui*.

Examples:—258, huimais; 291, 446, cuident; 437, puier; 224, puisque; 389, 524, 580, puis.

The development of *o*+*j* exactly corresponds to that of *ē*+*j*. It may become either *ui*, or *oi*, and the same dialects that write *ei* for *ē*+*j*, also write *oi*, and this is also true for *i* and *ui* (*Rom.* xvi, 122; *Z.* xii, 256; *Z.* ii, 276, 300).

o+nasal becomes *ue*, *o*.

Examples:—6, on; 9, 47, preudomne; 41, 44, 47, etc., bons; 153, hons; 22, 26, 65, 405, etc., quens.

In French the diphthongization of *o* takes place before *m* but not before *n*, although the latter is common to both the Picard and Wallonian. The northeast sometimes develops a parasitic *i* before *n*, an example of which is furnished by the text, in line 255, *joins* (*Sch.*, 102; *Neu.*, 44; *Chev.*, xlii; *Rom.* xvii, 559).

Tonic *o* in position remains.

Examples:—51, 119, 146, etc., ost; 97, 165, 299, etc., mors; 129, 136, 242, fort; 164, cors; 375, cors (cornu).

This is the usual form in the Isle-de-France, though it may diphthongize in the Wallonian (*Rom.* xvii, 560; *Sch.*, 105).

Atonic *o* becomes *o*, *ou*.

Examples:—36, dolor; 68, voloit; 19, trova; 76, morut; 475, 599, honnors; 133, honnora; 452, voutentiers; 500, pourriez.

The difference between the French and the

northeastern dialects is again mainly one of time. In the latter dialects the diphthongization is completed before the close of the thirteenth century, but not in the French. In *hounora* and *voulentiers*, we see northern influence, the French having, contrary to rule, retained the *o* in these words to the present day (*Sch.*, 135).

a+u becomes *o*.

Examples:—36, 106, 116, etc., *ot*; 114, *or*; 215, *parole*; 225, *otroie*; 305, *loeir*; 323, *plot*; 512, *loe*.

As *a+u* becomes open *o* in French, I speak of its development here, instead of under *a*.

In French, this *o* does not diphthongize, but it remained and assonanced with open *o*, out of Latin short *o*, since the time of Alexis. In the Wallonian, it may become either *ou*, *au*, or even *oi*, while the regular development in the Picard was to *eu* (*Sch.*, 109, 276; *Auc.*, 65; *Z.* ii, 299).

Two northern forms, *suet* and *sout*, occur in the text. *Suet*, in line 426, is an unusual formation, and is probably a mistake of the scribe for *scut*. The second example is of interest, as it furnishes evidence helping to establish the origin of the MS. The word *sout*, line 118, contains the diphthong *ou* common to the Wallonian, but this could not have been written by the author, since it rhymes with *ost* in the line below, which has an open *o*.

As the two vowels *o* (*Lt. o*) and *o* (*Lt. a+u*) were kept separated in Wallonian and were pronounced alike in French, the correct form must have been *sot* (*Sch.*, 268).

o+consonant becomes *o*, *au*.

Examples:—79, 607, *vorent*; 174, *vorres*; 222, *vorrons*; 347, *vorront*; 279, *vaurent*.

The *o* remains in the Isle-de-France, but becomes *au*, or *ou* in the North (*Auc.*, 63; *Neu.*, 65).

o

Tonic *o*, in open syllable becomes *o*, *ou*, *eu*.

Examples:—21, 62, 91, *traitor*; 36, *dolor*; 49, *contor*; 50, 73, etc., *amor*; 110, 151, 181, *seigneur*; 410, *honnor*; 411, *meillor*; 367, *signour*; 124, 134, etc., *preus*; 136, *perilleus*; 137, *orgueilleus*; 556, *seigneur*; 595, *honneur*.

The development of close *o* is quite uniform. It becomes *o*, *ou* and *eu*, and the main difference between the dialects is again one of

time. The diphthongs *ou*, *eu* become dominant in the North during the thirteenth century, while in the Isle-de-France, *o* still continued to be largely written; in some classes of words, especially those ending in *-or*, it was retained during the greater part of the next century. In all the dialects, the diphthong *ou* was the intermediate form between the older *o* and the modern *eu*, but in a few words, as in *amour*, *espous*, etc., the development was arrested at *ou*. A special Wallonian characteristic, which is also, though more rarely, found in the Picard is *oi* for close *o*. This does not occur in the text (*Sch.*, 277, 292; *Rom. Stud.* iv, 360; *Neu.*, 43; *Jahrb.* viii, 399).

Tonic *o* in close syllable becomes *o*, *ou*.

Examples:—4, 221, *douzes*; 8, 53, 107, etc., *moult*; 341, *oultre*; 519, 596, *jourz*; 86, 98, 103, 106, *tout*; 144, 192, 274, *tot*; 94, *jor*.

Little need be said about close *o* in position. It was diphthongized to *ou*, but there the development was arrested, and unlike *o* in open syllable it never became *eu*. The chief thing to be noted is that in the great majority of cases, it is represented in the text by *ou* instead of *o*. The diphthong *ou* is of early date, but it did not become the dominant form in French until the close of the thirteenth century. In the works of Rutebuef, who wrote in the last half of the century, *o*, for Latin *o* in close syllable, is still extensively used (*Sch.*, 99).

Tonic *o* before a nasal becomes *on*, and not *oun*, or *un* as is sometimes the case in the North (*Neu.*, 44; *Rom.* xvii, 560).

Examples:—5, *renon*; 16, 27, *traïson*; 58, 101, *prison*; 176, *barons*; 207, 556, *glouton*.

Atonic *o* becomes *o*, *ou*.

Examples:—1, *solas*; 602, *soulas*; 85, 87, 118, *soudans*; 207, *glouton*; 367, *gloton*; 398, *coroit*; 314, *sojorner*; 568, *douçor*.

The northern dialects during the thirteenth century generally prefer *ou*. It will be noticed that the same word is written sometimes with *o* and again with *ou*, and this confusion occurs in case of other vowels. This, however, need not mean that the pronunciation also varied. Atonic *o* was, at this time, probably pronounced like German *u*, but the custom of representing it by *ou* had not yet become firmly established.

CONSONANTS.

C.

ca becomes *ch*, *c* (*k*).

ce, *ci*, *ti* become *c* (*s*), *ch*.

Examples:—14, *ceu*; 92, *chair*; 84, *chans*; 104, 453, *cher*; 266, *chevaux*; 412, 519, 592, 600, *chevalerie*; 364, *ceval*; 331, *cevachies*; 290, 347, *calengier*; 302, *castias*; 300, *toche*; 488, *Chastillon*; 504, *chemin*.

10, *cel*; 27, *cilz*; 42, *cis*; 287, 289, *cha*; 358, *chis*; 303, *chiteis*; 309, 352, *francgis*; 539, 564, *francgis*.

The treatment of *c*, in the French and Picard, is of great importance in establishing the dialect of the author. Before Latin *a* it was written *ch* (*tch*) in French, and *c* (*k*) in Picard, while before Latin *e*, or *i*, it became respectively *c* (*ts*) and *ch* (*tch*). Thus the development of *c* in the two dialects is so different, that there can be no difficulty in noting the influence of each upon the text.

The Picard forms although numerous are outnumbered by the French. What little evidence is furnished by the rhyme also indicates the French pronunciation of *c*. In line 300, *c* before *a* in *toche* has the sound of *ch*, since it rhymes with *Antioche*. The rhyme *roces: delogent*, line 430, is incorrect in both the French and Picard dialects, but as *g* in *delogent* is soft, the French sound of *c* in *roces* would be less offensive to the ear than the hard sound of *k* that it has in the Picard (*Auc.*, 57, 61; *Rom.* vi, 617; *Alex.*, 85-89).

The hard and soft sound of *g* is generally represented as in French, but a few Picard forms, as *menga* and *loga*, are also found. The rhyme gives us no indication as to what was the pronunciation of *g* by the author (*Auc.*, 58, 62; *Alex.*, 89, 90; *Darm.*, 80).

Examples:—59, *conjoit*; 126, 420, 501, 516, etc., *gent*; 309, *logiet*; 431, *delogent*; 554, *deslogier*; 570, *joie*; 586, *mengie*; 131, *loga*; 318, *gavelos*; 583, *menga*.

L.

l before a consonant is replaced by *u*, or falls.

Examples:—8, 53, 107, 108, etc., *moult*; 29, 85, etc., *soudant*; 59, 108, *doucement*; 72, *loyaute*; 178, 285, *biaus*; 212, *vaut*; 287, *mieus*; 32, *madit*; 78, 91, *mavais*; 376, *mies*; 601, *filz*.

The words without *u* show Wallonian influ-

ence, for the Picard usually follows the French, and vocalizes *l*, since the end of the eleventh century. The one exception to the above rule is when *l* is preceded by *i* and followed by *s*. It then falls in French, but the Picard, on the contrary, makes no distinction between the vowels, and replaces *l* by *u* according to the general rule (*Rom.* xvii, 565; *Neu.*, 69; *Chev.* xlvi).

In order to rhyme with *conseilles*, *mieus*, in line 286, must have lost its *l*. As the copyists seldom changed the rhyme, this would indicate that the MS. is of Wallonian origin, but this view is not borne out by the remaining evidence.

Before and after a palatal, *l* becomes *l̃*.

Examples:—89, 121, *bataille*; 115, *soleil*; 137, *orgueilleus*; 152, *conseilliez*; 173, *apareilles*; 195, *conseil*; 415, *merveilant*; 416, *recueil-leir*.

In French, *l̃* is represented by *il̃*, or *ill̃*, while in the Wallonian, it is often written *ilh̃*. Of all the examples in the text, only one shows the influence of the latter dialect; namely, *esmerilhons*, in line 255 (*Rom.* xvii, 565; *Rom.* xix, 82).

S.

ts and *tj* become *s*, *z*.

Examples:—1, *grans*; 1, *solas*; 136, *fors*; 162, 165, 166, 173, etc., *tous*; 173, *apareilles*; 174, *vorres*; 277, *armes*; 153, *conseilliez*; 214, *voliez*; 218, *venez*; 519, *touuz*; 569, *assez*.

No difference was made in Picard in the pronunciation of *s* and *z*, but as they were kept distinct in the other dialects until quite late, their development is of some importance. In the Wallonian, *s* became *z* during the first half of the thirteenth century, while they were kept separated in French until near the close of the century (*Rom.* xvi, 127; *Rom.* xvii, 564; *Sch.*, 251, 322).

In the *Pas de Saladin*, *z* is seldom written, but is nearly always replaced by *s*. The rhymes *solas: pas*, 1; *crois: crois*, 37; *crois: bonfois*, 538; and *soulas: pas*, 602, prove that the use of *s* for *z* cannot be ascribed to the copyist alone, but that it was also known to the author.

s before consonants is generally retained.

Examples:—18, 85, *priest*; 19, 97, *crestien*;

34, fust; 38, 87, etc., fist; 37, hastiement; 103, despense; 140, destorbier.

It is omitted in 130, derubans; 390, Ronceval; 432, melleit.

The fall of *s* before consonants was earlier in French than in either the Wallonian or Picard. It, however, continued to be written in many words long after it had become silent, and thus its retention in the MS. cannot be considered as a characteristic of any particular dialect, nor is it a proof that it was still pronounced. In fact the MS. is not without evidence that the contrary must have been the case. In *toust*, line 573, for *tout*, *s* is inserted where it does not properly belong, and such a wrong insertion of a letter may be taken as evidence of its fall. *Melleit*, line 432, shows that it was silent also before liquids. Here *s* was assimilated to *l* (*Rom.* xvi, 123; *Darm.*, 102).

The prosthetic *e*, or *i* before *s* impure, has always been a characteristic of the French, but it is often omitted in the Wallonian (*Lor. Ps.*, xliii; *Sch.*, 183, *Rom.* xvii, 564).

Examples:—241, 490, *espee*; 254, *esperons*; 326, 507, *estendart*; 353, *estrine*; 357, 427, 457, *escut*; 387, *estor*; 422, 439, *espie*; 465, *isnelepas*; 560, *escler*.

W.

German *w* becomes *gu*, *g*.

Examples:—46, 221, *garderent*; 9, *regarder*; 134, *guerre*; 187, *regarda*; 231, 488, *Gautier*; 238, 242, 487, 490, *Guillaume*.

German *w* belongs especially to the Wallonian and the East, while in French it is replaced by *gu*, or *g*. The letter occurs twice in the text. *Walerans*, line 401, is a German word which did not enter into the popular language, and which, therefore, is written with *w*, or with *v*, as in lines 235 and 485. The *w* of *weil*, 286, is for Latin *v*, and may be either Wallonian or Picard (*Z.* ii, 275; *Rom.* xvi, 121; *Jahrb.* viii, 390).

A Wallonian characteristic that does not occur in the text, is the insertion of *w* between two vowels, in order to destroy the hiatus, as in *owes*, *owist*, etc., (*Rom.* xvii, 563; *Z.* ii, 284; *Jahrb.* viii, 390, 407).

Ñ.

ñ becomes *gn*, *ngn*.

Examples:—39, *Bretaigne*; 40, *Alemaigne*; 110, 285, *seignor*; 151, 181, 529, *seingnor*; 350, *poignant*; 370, *poignant*; 506, *compagnon*; 562, *resoignoit*.

This mode of writing *ñ* agrees with the French, but in the Wallonian it is generally represented by *nh*, *ngh* or *ng*. The writing of *ngn* for *ñ* is foreign both to the French and the northern dialects (*Rom.* xvii, 565).

qu becomes *qu*, *c*.

Examples:—5, 12, 46, 58, etc., *qui*; 27, *cink*; 30, *quoi*; 68, 74, 88, 95, etc., *que*; 80, *car*; 90, 118, 123, *cant*; 106, *quant*.

When *qu* lost its labial sound in French, it was pronounced like *k*, and hence was often replaced by that consonant, or by *c*. Both forms occur indiscriminately in the text (*Sch.*, 214).

The Wallonian often adds *r* to the end of a word, and drops it in the group mute plus *r*. Neither characteristic occurs in the text (*Rom.* xvii, 565).

Examples:—63, *destruction*, 81, *empresent*; 95, 181, *nostre*; 170, *combatre*; 171, *autre*.

Contrary to the French usage the Picard and Wallonian do not insert a consonant in the groups *l'r*, *n'r*, *m'l*, and *s'r*. The author of the MS. has followed no regular rule. There is either assimilation, or the consonant is omitted from the first two groups, but it is always inserted in the last two (*Sch.*, 230; *Auc.*, 58; *M. L.* i, 475-479, *Jahrb.* viii, 392).

Examples:—79, 607, *vorent*; 174, *vorres*; 279, *vauront*; 347, 453, *vorront*; 83, *tenroint*; 350, 352, *vinrent*; 44, 189, 204, *ensemble*; 555, 580, *pristrent*.

The development of final *t* will be spoken of under verbs, and that of *t+s* has been mentioned under *s*. Otherwise, the consonant presents nothing of interest for the study of the text.

ARTICLE.

The article has undergone but few variations since the earliest times, and its use in the different dialects was with few exceptions the same.

The forms in the text are nearly all French. There is one example of the use of the masc. *li* for the fem. *la*, in *li serre*, line 542, but elsewhere, and even in the same line with *serre*, the regular feminine article is used. The use

of the masc. article for the feminine is a universal Picard characteristic, and even occurs in the Wallonian, so that its absence from the text is strong presumption against a northern origin (*Rom.* vi, 617; *Neu.*, 118; *Rom.* xvii, 566).

Examples:—11, 15, 22, 23, 25, 35, 41, 65, 69, etc., masc. *li*; 4, 28, 29, 31, 33, 57, 99, 115, etc., masc. *le*; 8, 38, 51, 64, 79, 109, 121, 135, 161, 164, etc., Nom. & Acc. Fem. *la*.

All of the contracted forms belong also to the dialect of the Isle-de-France.

Examples:—380, *al*; 61, 120, 129, 182, etc., *au*; 140, 432, 445, *aus*; 1, 399, 411, 442, 550, *del*; 54, 414, 610, *du*; 4, 21, 54, 175, 272, *des*; 363, *es*; 364, *do*; 495, *as*.

The modern Nom. Sing. *le* is a late formation. In the texts examined by Knauer, *Jahrb.* x, 1, *li* is still nearly exclusively used in those dating from the beginning of the fourteenth century, and Fallot (*Rech.*, 41), states that *le* is very rare until after 1300. Therefore, as *le* occurs four times; namely, in lines 85, 87, 107 and 196, it may have been added after that date.

Another variant of the Nom. Sing. *li* is *el*, in line 339. This is a very unusual form and is evidently a mistake of the copyist, who must have intended to write either *li*, or *le*. According to Fallot, *loc. cit.* 42, no authenticated example of *el* for the Nom. Sing. has yet been noticed.

In line 495, *as* is a contracted form for *a les*. The later *aus* dates from the thirteenth century (*Rech.*, 45). The contractions *del*, *al* were replaced during the thirteenth century by *du* and *au*. *Do*, a strictly Burgundian form, became *dou*, *du*, at about the same date (*Rech.*, 44).

NOUNS.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the declensions were much simplified, and all masculine nouns received an *s* in the Nom. Sing. They were still further simplified toward the close of the century. At this time, the accusative takes the place of the nominative, with the result that the declensions of all nouns, both masculine and feminine, were reduced to one; namely, they have no ending in the singular, while the plural adds *s*.

The ending of the Nom. Sing. is still quite

well preserved in the text, but it is apparent that the confusion, incident to the general breaking up of the declensions, has begun. Thus both correct and incorrect forms appear in the same line, as *fu moult preu et sages*, 134; *tout li mondes loe*, 512; *li preus Guillaume*, 487, and, further, in lines 80, 278, 328, etc.

It is not clear what forms were used by the author, as the evidence furnished by the rhymes is misleading. Some, as *sages* (N. S.): *passages* (A. P.), 124; *amirans* (A. P.): *sou. dans* (N. S.), 284, and further in lines 130, 168, 338, etc., demand a Nom. Sing. with *s*, but others, in lines 3, 49, 67, 344, etc., pay no attention to the ending. The question cannot be satisfactorily settled without the aid of a second MS.

In the examples given below, adjectives are included as their declension does not differ from that of the nouns.

Examples:—Nom. Sing. with *s*, 11, 15, 18, 22, 26, 35, 41, 43, 65, etc.; without *s*, 69, 80, 134, 339, 365, etc.; Nom. Pl. with *s*, 49, 176, 349, 451, 494, etc.; without *s*, 62, 91, 105, 207, 208, 274, 275, etc.

PRONOUNS.

The pronouns of the first person singular are *je*, *ge*, *gie*, *jou*.

Examples:—37, 102, 173, 215, 225, etc., *je*; 77, 86, 96, 154, 449, 479, *ge*; 237, *gie*; 231, *jou*.

The earliest form of the first personal pronoun, in the dialect of the Isle-de-France, was *jo*. It is still found in the *Alexis*, where the *o* is never elided before an initial vowel, while in the *Roland*, though the elision is not universal, it is no longer rare. Thus *jo* was reduced to *je* at the end of the eleventh century, and soon became the dominant form. There were no further modifications in the French, but its development in the Picard and the East has been slightly different.

In Burgundy, during the first half of the thirteenth century, *ge* was used by the side of, and indiscriminately with, *je*. Another variant of the same pronoun was *gie*, belonging to the last half of the century, and also confined to the East.

The Picard has but two forms, an earlier *jou* and the modern *je*. Unlike the French, however, the latter does not become universal un-

til quite late, examples of the use of *jou* being found during the fourteenth century (*Alex.*, 33; *Sch.*, 396; *Rech.*, 235-240).

The Acc. Sing. of the first personal pronoun is *me*, never *mi*, as in the North, and its use in the text needs no comment. The tonic form *moi* occurs once, in line 74, as object of a verb in place of *me*. Fallot, *loc. cit.* 242, states that *moi* for *me*, or *mi* dates from the second half of the thirteenth century, and that, while in Picardy it was especially written after verbs, in Burgundy it was placed after prepositions. However, the solitary example found in the MS. can prove nothing. The use of *moi* in place of the nominative *je*, as subject of a verb, dates from the fourteenth century, and does not occur in the text (*Jahrb.* xi, 234; *Rech.*, 242; *Sch.*, 395, 396; *Neu.*, 22).

Examples:—79, 84, 100, 101, 103, 152, 214, 224, 229, 249, *me*.

Of the plural of the first and second personal pronouns, it need only be said that in the majority of cases they are written with *o*, as *nos* and *vos*, instead of the modern *nous*, *vous*.

Examples:—156, 165, 166, 170, 212, 202, 205, 314, etc., *nos*; 183, 541, 545, *nous*; 66, 154, 174, 183, 185, 214, 215, etc., *vos*; 247, 286, 329, 414, 493, 525, *vous*.

THIRD PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

The Nom. Sing. masculine, of the third personal pronoun, had in Old French the same form as today. During the thirteenth century, an *s* was sometimes added by analogy to the first declension of nouns, but this usage never became general, and does not occur in the text (*Jahrb.* xi, 235).

The feminine pronoun was written either *ele*, or *elle*, and both were common in the Middle Ages. The latter, however, became the dominant form after the thirteenth century, and is the only one found in the text (*Rech.*, 249).

Examples:—19, 38, 61, 68, 100, 116, 201, 220, 254, 256, *il*; 74, 75, *elle*.

The Nom. Pl. of the Modern French differs from the old form only by the addition of *s*. Throughout the thirteenth century, *il* remained unchanged, but it is replaced by *ils* during the next century. Fallot, *loc. cit.* 249, gives 1305 as the date of the first example of *ils* in the texts which he examined (*Sch.*, 398; *Jahrb.* xi, 235; *Rech.*, 249).

Examples:—30, 269, 432, 454, 513, 584, *il*.

The objective singular was *li*, or *lui*. The former, though not found in Modern French, was still in frequent use during the fourteenth century. The old rule that *li* should be used as indirect object after verbs, and *lui* after prepositions, remained in force until toward the close of the thirteenth century. The rule is observed in our MS. in the case of *li* with verbs, but there is confusion between the two forms after prepositions (*Jahrb.* xi, 236; *Rech.*, 251-257, *Sch.*, 398, 399).

Examples:—*li*, after verbs, 122, 240, 357, 361, 461, etc.; after prepositions, 109, 294; *lui*, after prepositions, 157, 189.

Of the objective plural, it is only necessary to mention the use of *les*, for the dative *lor*, in line 60, a characteristic common to the Walloonian. In all French dialects after the close of the thirteenth century, the objective was often written in place of the nominative, both in the case of pronouns and of nouns. The only example occurs in line 104, where *li* is used for *il*, as subject of a verb. The earlier and later forms of *lor* and *leur* are used indiscriminately; namely, *lor* in lines 264, 347, 372, and *leur*, lines 577, 589 (*Rom.* xv, 130; *Rech.*, 257).

POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

With the exception of *vo*, in lines 184 and 501, all of the possessive adjectives and pronouns are French. This is of some importance, as the Picard forms occur quite frequently in most of the northern dialects (*Rom.* xvii, 566; *Neu.*, 63; *Sch.*, 411).

Examples:—306, *mon*; 290, *ma*; 103, *mes*; 119, *son*; 155, 197, 198, 253, 283, 340, 377, *son*; 126, 133, 296, 420, 523, *sa*; 162, 261, 611, *ses*; 317, *vos*; 533, *nos*; 95, *nostre*; 248, 320, *vostre*.

The possessive *lor*, *leur*, does not add *s* when before plural nouns. The change from *lor* to *lors* and *leurs* dates from the close of the thirteenth century (*Sch.*, 411; *Rech.*, 273).

Examples:—82, 83, 85, 92, 457, 587, *lor*; 7, 62, 337, 478, 547, 595, *leur*.

DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS.

Both classes of demonstrative pronouns, those from Latin *ecce-ille*, and those from *ecce-iste*, are represented in the text. The declension of the first class, including both tonic and a-

tonic forms, is as follows,—

Nom. Sing.	cis, chis, cil.
Ac. Sing.	cel.
Nom. Pl.	cil, cilz, cis.
Ac. Pl.	ceulz, cheaus.

Examples:—18, 42, 209, 308, cis; 358, chis; 110, cil; 10, 167, 321, 546, cel; 46, 371, 392, cil; 27, 204, cilz; 402, cis; 2, cheus; 599, ceulz.

With the exception of the Picard *chis*, *cheaus*, all of the above are French. The Nom. Pl. *cil* remained unchanged up to the close of the thirteenth century, when it added *s* in analogy to the declension of nouns. In lines 155 and 158, *celui*, in place of *icelui*, is used as an absolute pronoun.

The second class is not so numerous. It includes the usual Isle-de-France forms, and only the Picard feminine accusative *cesti*, in line 258, needs be noted (*Sch.*, 402, 404; *Rech.*, 299-306).

CONJUGATION.

The verbs present some unmistakable Wallonian characteristics, such as the retention of final *t* in the third person, singular, and past participle, and the writing of *ei*, for *e(a)*. The former is treated here, as it concerns more especially the verbs.

Intervocalic *t* and final *t*, unsupported by another consonant, disappears in French by the beginning of the twelfth century (*Sch.*, 175, 318; *Grundriss*, 581). Though probably no longer pronounced, it is still represented in the *Alexis*, and it prevents the elision of a preceding *e*, before a word with an initial vowel (*Alex.*, 34). In the *Chanson de Roland*, fifty years later, it has begun to fall, and was soon after dropped entirely. During the following two hundred years, this rule is strictly adhered to in all the better MSS., but in the fourteenth century, final *t* reappears in the third person, singular, and the past participle of verbs. Here we again meet with such forms as *amet*, *fut*, which were correct in the twelfth century, but which had been replaced by others without *t* (*Jahrb.* xii, 163).

But such forms are late and comparatively rare, and do not adequately explain the frequent use of final *t* in the text. Its presence must, therefore, be due to some outside influence, as it cannot be considered a character-

istic common to the dialect of the Isle-de-France. Of all the northern and eastern dialects, the Wallonian is the only one that generally retains an unsupported final *t* during the thirteenth century. In the dialect of Namur, it is of frequent occurrence even as late as the end of the century, but this is exceptional, and, as a rule, it has fallen before 1250. The same characteristic is also found in eastern Picardy (*Rom.* xvii, 563; xix, 81).

Examples:—without *t*, 19, trova; 22, 69, 75, 112, 124, 134, 242, 339, fu; 42, croisa; 91, prouve; 105, fondu; 106, conte; 120, 283, manda; 122, ramanda; 123, atendra; 127, coste; 131, loga; 132, ama; 138, jura; 139, fera; 187, regarda; 210, 240, agree; 211, baee; 217, apella.

With *t*, 10, 17, 80, 340, fut; 60, contat; 76, morut; 142, alat; 144, conteit; 270, esporon-neit; 311, respondit; 335, 363, 368, at; 343, ferat.

The above examples show that the French forms are much more numerous than those of the North.

FIRST PERSON PLURAL.

With the exception of *sommes*, and of the perfect tense, the ending of the first person plural is *-ons*, or *-on*. The latter is not a dialectical difference, but is sometimes used in place of *-ons* (*Darm.*, 222). This ending is assured by the rhyme *deffendon: glouton*, line 206.

Examples:—89, avoms; 104, 157, avons; 154, sommes; 183, aiderons; 184, devons; 211, corons; 221, gardérons; 223, deffendrons; 541, meton; 545, serons.

According to Diez (*Gram.*, 567), the regular ending for the Picard is *-omes*. The French ending *-ons* is, however, found in some parts of Picardy, and is the rule in Wallonian. The ending *-oms*, of *avoms*, in line 89, is the primitive one, and does not stand for *-omes*. It was gradually replaced by *-ons* (*Rom. Stud.* iv, 361).

IMPERFECT, *-ions*, *iez*.

The ending of the first and second person plural of the imperfect and conditional is, in French, *-ions* and *-iez*. The older form *-iens* is still occasionally used in Rutebuef, but it finally disappears by the end of the century. The Picard has *-iemes*, while throughout the East *-iens* and *-iez* were retained. These further differ from the French in having but

one syllable. The ending *-iens* in our text occurs only in nouns, but it, as well as *-iez* in *pourriez*, line 500, counts as two syllables (*Z.* ii, 281; Diez, *Gram.*, 567).

IMPERFECT, *-eve*.

No examples occur of *-eve*, the ending of the imperfect indicative in the East. This tense is of frequent occurrence, but always with the regular French ending *-oi*, *-oit*, etc., (*Z.* ii, 276).

Examples:—53, 522, avoit; 58, 276, 277, 525, estoit; 72, aportoit; 83, tenroient; 190, venoit; 232, feroit; 312, appelloit; 415, aloit; 417, quidoit; 422, amoit; 510, escoutoit.

PERFECTS, *-iu*.

The perfect tense offers several forms that distinguishes it sharply from the Picard and Wallonian. Thus the endings *-iu*, *-arent* are entirely wanting, while *-ont* and *-isent* are rare.

Suchier, *loc. cit.* 255 ff., has fully described the development of the *iu* perfects. They may be divided into two classes, according to the endings of their stem accented forms, namely, a. those in *-oi*, *-ot*, *-orent*, and b. those in *-ui*, *-ut*, *-urent*. These are the regular French forms, and the only ones that appear in the text (*Rom.* xvi, 121; *Z.* ii, 283, 286).

Examples:—36, 106, 116, 130, 179, etc., ot; 30, 78, etc., orent; 94, plot; 209, 360, vot; 360, pot; 76, morut; 84, durent; 458, connut.

PERFECT, *-ont*.

The perfect ending *-ont* occurs in *laisont*, 92; and *gardont*, 603. On account of their similarity to the endings of the present tense, they never came into general use, even in the Wallonian, but were soon superseded by the regular forms (*Rom.* xv, 132; xvi, 121; *Z.* viii, 122).

PERFECT, *-istrent*.

Both the endings *-strent* and *-sent* are found in the text. The latter is the regular Picard and Wallonian form. The ending *-rent* is simply a variant of *-strent*, formed by analogy to *viurent*, and belongs to the French (*Sch.*, 437; Diez, *Gram.*, 580; *Auc.*, 62).

Examples:—27, 447, 579, 582, 592, 595, firent; 159, fisent; 177, 554, virent; 555, 580, pristrent.

PERFECT, *-erent*.

The Wallonian ending *-arent*, of the third person, plural, perfect tense, is entirely want-

ing, and only the French forms in *-erent*, or *-ierent* are found (*Rom.* xvii, 567; *Z.* ii, 276).

Examples:—2, 46, garderent; 31, livrerent; 52, ariverent; 57, 345, trouverent; 93, tornerent; 266, 333, monterent.

Many of the changes which the verb underwent during the last half of the thirteenth century, do not appear in the text.

The ending *e* of the first person, singular, present tense, began to be added at this time, and it is frequently found in Rutebuef. The only example *otroie*, line 225, must be due to the copyist, as the word counts as two syllables and not as three (*Sch.*, 435).

Other examples are *di*, 66, 154, and *dient*, 216, in place of *dis* and *disent* respectively; *sui*, 153, 173; *baee*, 211; *corons*, 211; for later *suis*, *bee*, *courons*. The modern forms, mentioned by Schwan 433, 442, 444, all date from the close of the thirteenth century.

ELISION AND HIATUS.

It is unnecessary to make a detailed study of the rules of elision and hiatus, as they remained constant throughout the greater part of the Middle Ages.

Final mute *e* before a following vowel suffered elision since the earliest times (*Alexis*, 31). Although the monosyllables *je*, *ce*, *se*, *que*, were generally subject to the rule, they could if the metre required it, form hiatus before a word with an initial vowel as late as the sixteenth century (*Traité*, 394). This was due to the fact that their vowels, in the early literary period were distinctly pronounced, and it was not until after the time of the *Alexis*, that they were reduced to mute *e* (*Alexis*, 31).

The examples in which the *e* is elided are so numerous that none are here given. In the following, the final *e* forms hiatus.

Examples:—204, ce est; 226, se il; 255, que uns; 287, ce est; 293, 307, 466, je ai; 454, que il.

Examples of elision which are not tolerated in the modern language are as follows:—the relative *qui* in *qu'a l'ost*, 564; and *gel*, 154, for *ge le*, and *ges*, 479, for *ge les*.

Pretonic *e* in hiatus, counts as a separate syllable. It first became silent in the North during the thirteenth century, but it did not disappear in the Isle-de-France until much later (*Traité*, 397; *Sch.*, 309-311; *Jahrb.* viii, 407).

Examples:—14, ceue; 95, eussent; 113, 369, veist; 464, 466, veu; 467, reonde; 500, veoir; 545, aseur; 586, beut.

F. E. LODEMAN.

Cornell University.

GERMANIC GRAMMAR.

Urgermanische Grammatik. Einführung in das vergleichende Studium der altgermanischen Dialekte. Von DR. W. STREITBERG. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1896. 8vo, pp. xx, 372.

THE purpose of Streitberg's book is to furnish students of philology with an outline which, through a comparison of the different Germanic dialects establishes the common basis of Germanic primitive speech in its relation to the other Indo-European dialects. The book will thus be of service to students in Germanics as well as in Comparative Philology.

It may be said, at the outset, that the author has accomplished his object admirably, with the scholarship and the skill of presentation to which we are accustomed in his writings, and with true pedagogical insight gained by several years' lecturing on this topic. Those, of course, that will take the work for an "Elementarbuch" in the common acceptance of the word—among whom we may include the amusing reviewer in the *School Guardian*—will be sadly disappointed. But by all those who have labored through the immense literature of Germanic philology, and who have succeeded in removing the seven seals from Kluge's masterly, yet more involved, article in Paul's *Grundriss*, the far clearer presentation by Streitberg will be gladly welcomed.

Yet with all the praise we have to bestow on the new book we must confess that the idea of an "introductory treatment" ought to have kept the author's eye on the many students of Germanics who have not had the good fortune of listening to the instructor's elucidation. There are few universities, even in Germany, where courses covering the field of the *Urgermanische Grammatik* are offered. A consideration of the student's needs would reduce the many question-marks that will surely remain in many a copy as evidence of its use. For instance, the treatment of the verb would

have been more intelligible by adding a paragraph on the Sanskrit verb. The reviewer has always, in his lectures on the Germanic verb, started with the Sanskrit present formation. This may not be strictly scientific, yet the student gets a more plastic, and clear impression of the rather involved forms. Can we hope that an English edition will yield theoretical scientific considerations to practical pedagogical demands?

The volume opens with a concise bibliography of references. Students in Germany can now use the translation of Giles' *Manual of Comparative Philology* by Joh. Hertel (O. R. Reisland), while V. Henry's *Précis de grammaire comparée de l'anglais et de l'allemand* is now available in the author's own English translation (ed. 1894).—P. 13. The existence of the Crimean Goths extends beyond the sixteenth century; cf. now R. Loewe, *Die Reste der Germanen am Schwarzen Meer*, 1886.—P. 14. Instead of "Niederdeutsch," (ii, b) "Niedersächsisch" would have been more appropriate.

The following section, "Laut- und Akzentlehre," is a masterpiece of composition, clear and succinct, yet sufficiently comprehensive for orientation. In § 36 the author mentions Wundt's law of apperception (cf. also p. 168). This important phenomenon, according to which two adjoining syllables vary in stress, or are at least subordinated by the human ear, will have to pass the further test of experimental phonetics. The question seems to be more complicated; cf. the Ūpsála controversy. For more details on this interesting point see also V. Michels, *I. F.* vii, 163, and M. H. Jelinek, *ib.*, 160.

In his vowel system Streitberg condenses the results of his own investigations. As the ablaut question is at present *in fluxu* it might have been fair to devote a paragraph to the treatment by other scholars, whose views have certainly not been disposed of for good by the author of the 'Dehnstufe.' A short delineation of Osthoff's system would have been helpful to the students that have been introduced to his scheme and nomenclature. In § 46 the *ə* is defined as "Murmelvokal." It would be desirable to avoid all characterizations of this supposedly one-moric reduction